



2015

Tucson-Pima County Historical Commission
Plans Review Subcommittee

SPECIAL ON-SITE MEETING

Summary of Minutes

Friday, December 11, 2015,
Broadway Village Historic Landmark / Shopping Center
3016 E. Broadway Boulevard, Tucson, Arizona 85716

REQUIRES RATIFICATION

1. Call to Order / Roll Call:

Meeting called to session at 9:08 AM

Commissioners: Teresita Majewski (Chair), Patsy Waterfall, Jim Sauer, Helen Erickson, Sharon Chadwick, Arthur Stables

Staff: Frank Dillon, Jim Mazzocco (PDSD), Dr. Jonathan Mabry, Nicole Ewing-Gavin (OIP), Piroshka Glinsky (City Attorney), Alison Miller (Ward 6)

2. Review Exterior Alterations at the Broadway Village Historic Landmark as Part of the Natural Grocers Adaptive Re-Use Project

Staff and the Tucson-Pima County Historical Commission (T-PCHC) Plans Review Subcommittee (PRS) met on-site with the applicant, Fred Howard to inspect exterior alterations for consistency with the previously reviewed and approved plans.

The purpose of the meeting was to identify any discrepancies between the construction and previously approved plans to inform staff of which conditions of an existing 'stop-work' issued by the Planning and Development Services Department (PDSD) could be removed to prevent weather damage or public health and safety hazards. Additionally the meeting was intended to inform staff of any alterations that had not been previously approved and keep the applicable conditions of the existing 'stop work' order intact until subsequent review and recommendations were made by the T-PCHC PRS and forwarded to the PDSD Director to render a decision on the outstanding items.

Minutes: 12/11/15

Approved: 1/13/16

Staff Dillon and Mabry explained that they conducted an on-site inspection on Tuesday December 8, 2015 with Mr. Howard after the stop work order was issued. Staff Mabry added that none of the observed alterations would jeopardize the status of Broadway Village's listing on the National Register of Historic Places.

Mr. Howard led Staff and the T-PCHC PRS to inspect the following issues:

- A. Replacement of the existing historic clay tile roof with a new clay tile roof;
- B. Replacement of historic pavers in the courtyard adjacent to the east elevation of the building;
- C. Alteration of a historic window into a door on the north elevation;
- D. Alterations to the roof of the second floor enclosure

Mr. Howard explained that there were additional items that he would like to review with the T-PCHC PRS but Chair Majewski explained that we would only discuss the items in question and he would have provide a separate proposal and attend a future T-PCHC PRS meeting for review and recommendations.

Regarding Item A, Mr. Howard explained that the intent to replace the roof was unclear at the August 27, 2015 T-PCHC PRS meeting due to a typographical error on the plans. Mr. Howard explained that the keynote on the plans was to reflect a 'new' roof where the plans read 'existing' roof. Mr. Howard explained that there were with the exiting roof that needed repair and required removal of the historic clay tiles.

T-PCHC PRS Commissioners requested to see samples of the proposed replacement clay roof tiles. The T-PCHC Commissioners raised concern specifically to how the clay roof tiles would be replaced and if they would follow the pattern, detailing and design of the original roof. Chair Majewski suggested that staff provide historic drawing and photographs to the applicant to help inform the design and layout of the proposed new roof plan to be reviewed by the T-PCHC PRS at a subsequent on-site review.

Regarding Item B, Mr. Howard explained that the paving plan was outlined at the August 27, 2015 T-PCHC PRS meeting and that the keynotes on the plans indicate that the historic pavers would be replaced with new pavers to match those at Falora Pizza in the same shopping center.

Mr. Howard added that there are approximately 8 different types of pavers throughout the Broadway Village Shopping Center and the intent was to eliminate tripping hazards and provide homogeneity to the existing materials. Mr. Howard explained that the historic pavers were mortared in and were too damaged to reuse once they were removed.

Commissioners Erickson and Sauer explained that the previously reviewed and approved plans at the T-PCHC PRS meeting on August 27, 2015 were misleading, in that they indicate a project area delineated by a red boundary around the building and a note reading 'this project'. Staff Dillon confirmed that the alterations were indicated on the approved plans and keynotes.

Regarding Item C, Mr. Howard explained that the window removal and door replacement was outlined on the plans reviewed and recommended for approval at the at the August 27, 2015 T-PCHC PRS meeting. Mr. Howard explained that the keynotes on the plans indicate that the window would be replaced by a new bronze anodized sliding door system.

Minutes: 12/11/15

Approved: 1/13/16

T-PCHC Commissioners mentioned again that the specific details of alterations from a window to a door were misleading and that insufficient information was provided to determine the end appearance of the north elevation. Commissioner Sauer asked Mr. Howard if they would consider removing the areas where the Masonry had been 'toothed in' and adding a reveal to match the historic character. Mr. Howard agreed to removing the areas of masonry that had been 'toothed in' and adding a reveal. T-PCHC PRS Commissioners suggested that the applicant prepare drawings to inform the design and layout of the proposed new door to be reviewed by the T-PCHC PRS at a subsequent on-site review.

Regarding Item D, Mr. Howard explained that the window removal and door replacement was outlined on the plans reviewed and recommended for approval at the August 27, 2015 T-PCHC PRS meeting. Mr. Howard explained that the sheet A2 of the plans indicate that the upper level floor plan.

T-PCHC Commissioners mentioned again that the specific details of alterations from on the second story were unclear and that insufficient information was provided to determine the end appearance of the upper level enclosure. Commissioner Sauer asked Mr. Howard if they would consider removing the fascia board and designing the rafters to match the historic photos. Mr. Howard agreed to the removal of fascia board and shaping the rafters to match historic photos. T-PCHC PRS Commissioners suggested that the applicant prepare drawings to inform the design and layout of the proposed new upper level to be reviewed by the T-PCHC PRS at a subsequent on-site review.

Chair Majewski suggested that feedback from the members of the public considered prior to action by the T-PCHC PRS.

Regarding Item A, Members of the public expressed discontent over the removal of the historic roof tiles and added that the historic Joseler roof tile design was a character defining feature. Staff Dillon explained that per the Unified Development Code like for like materials are allowed when repairing and replacing historic features such as roofs.

Regarding Item B, Members of the public expressed discontent over the removal of the historic pavers and added that the historic Joseler pavers were a character defining feature. The T-PCHC PRS Commissioners asked Mr. Howard if he would consider replacing the pavers with locally sourced historic Joseler pavers that had been salvaged. Mr. Howard explained that there had already been a significant investment in the approved pavers and they would not consider that option.

Regarding Item C, Members of the public expressed discontent over the alteration to the north elevation and explained that a conversion from window to a window to a sliding 'grocery store' door was not in keeping with the historic integrity of the building. Chair Majewski explained that the T-PCHC PRS often reviews plans for adaptive re-use of historic buildings and it is important to understand that the alterations are reversible and the proposal is an adaptive re-use project, not a restoration or rehabilitation.

Concerns regarding the ability of the T-PCHC PRS to make an informed review at the time of the August 27th presentation were also raised by Mr. Demion Clinco, President of the Historic Preservation Foundation. Mr. Clinco questioned if the T-PCHC PRS had sufficient information at the time of the review. Mr. Clinco asked if the City Attorney Piroshka Glinsky could speak to the

Minutes: 12/11/15

Approved: 1/13/16

legal authority of the T-PCHC PRS. Mrs. Glinsky explained that she was on-site to observe the process and would not provide any legal advice regarding the merits of the project. Staff Dillon explained that the application package and materials submitted was found complete. Staff Dillon added if the T-PCHC PRS felt that they needed any additional information they could have made the request prior to the review meeting, or continued the meeting until further information was provided. Mr. Dillon reminded the group that the T-PCHC PRS is an advisory body to the PDSD Director and do not approve or deny projects.

Prior to action Staff Dillon reminded the T-PCHC PRS Commissioners that there was an existing 'stop work' order with conditions on the property and to consider any weather related issues that may cause further impact to the historic resource or any issues that may cause a public health and safety hazard.

Chair Majewski closed the floor for public comments. Commissioner Sauer made a six part motion including the following items:

Part 1: The recommendation that the applicant be allowed to "dry in" the roof on the north side of the building; and

Part 2: The recommendation that the applicant be allowed to keep the larger opening on the north façade of the building as previously approved. We further recommend that the applicant be required to redo the work of closing the adjacent smaller opening to preserve the size and shape of the doorway that was 'toothed in'. The size and shape of that doorway should match historic photos and drawings. This recommendation is consistent with the applicant's verbal agreement to complete this request; and

Part 3: With regard to the work on the second floor roof, the recommendation the applicant be required to remove the fascia board and shape the ends of the rafters to match historic photos. This matches what the applicant has verbally agreed to do; and

Part 4: With regard to the pavers in the central walkway, the recommendation that the applicant be allowed to retain the new pavers as currently installed, and as indicated on the documents submitted for the previous review that were approved. This recommendation is subject to investigation by city staff regarding the prior approval. An additional recommendation that the applicant be encouraged to consider replacing these pavers with pavers that more closely resemble the original pavers as shown in historic photographs; and

Part 5: The recommendation that city staff provide the applicant with historic photographs and historic drawings that show the original design of the building; and

Part 6: The recommendation that the applicant be required to work with city staff to use the standard "Change of Condition" process for any and all future work that is a change from what has already been approved. This includes several items discussed today, including:

- a. installation of new tile on the roof on the north side of the building; and
- b. changes to the arched opening on the east facade facing the central walkway (removal of existing; and
- c. door and replacing with a "barn door" to match other like openings)

Minutes: 12/11/15

Approved: 1/13/16

The motion was seconded by Commissioner Stables. The motion passed 6-0.

3. **Call to the Audience**

Please see item #2

4. **Adjournment**

Meeting adjourned at 10:45 a.m.